



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/780,962	02/09/2001	Erik James Reed	40406/DJS/Y62	6926
23363	7590	10/20/2005	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP			SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A	
PO BOX 7068			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			2154	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/780,962	REED, ERIK JAMES
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mohammad A. Siddiqi	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-36 and 55-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 37-54 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-36 and 55-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/02/2005.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-36 and 55-58 are presented for examination. Claims 37-54 have been cancelled. *Claims 55-58 are new.*

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 05/02/2005 was filed after the mailing date of the Office Action filed on 04/26/2005. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/26/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1, 23, 25,27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims do not show any connectivity between verification database and network servers. Applicant is requested to telephone examiner to clarify the steps of claimed invention.

6. Claim 1, 23, 25,27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: How the table of content information is received at the network server".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-36 and 55-58 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over anticipated by Hurtado et al. (6,611,812) (hereinafter Hurtado) in view of Collart et al. (6,405,203) (hereinafter Collart).

9. As per claim 1, Hurtado discloses in a system comprising a communications network connecting a plurality of network servers and a plurality of computers, a network server comprising:

a verification database comprising (col 26, lines 45-65, and col 31, lines 55-64);

master table of contents (metadata provides information about the content, quality, condition, and other characteristics of data, here metadata provides information about the music CD .g., artist, producer, album cover, track length, col 12, lines 17-25) information corresponding to each of a

plurality of sets of digitized content (col 20, lines 14-18 and col 31, lines 55-64);

at least one master songprint identifier (col 12, lines 17-25)

corresponding to each of the plurality of sets of digitized content (col 31, lines 55-58); and

wherein the network server is programmed to (fig 9, col 74, line 60);

receive at least one of a plurality of songprint identifiers from the at least one of the plurality of computers (col 25, lines 50-67), and

wherein each songprint identifier is derived from digitized content. Hurtado specifically does not disclose receive at least one of a plurality of selections of table of contents information from at least one of the plurality of

computers . However, Collart discloses receive at least one of a plurality of selections of table of contents information from at least one of the plurality of computers (600-650, fig 6). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hurtado and Collart. The motivation would have been to preventing unauthorized users from using the content of an electronic storage medium.

10. As per claim 2 and 30, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses to receive one selection of table of

content information from the at least one of the plurality of computers (fig 6, col 25, lines 24-38 and col 31, lines 40-67).

11. As per claims 3 and 31, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses to receive a songprint identifier from the at least one of the plurality of computers (fig 6, col 25, lines 24-38 and col 31, lines 40-67).

12. As per claim 4, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses wherein the table of content information comprises at least one length of digital content (fig 16, col 61, lines 25-29).

13. As per claim 5, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses to request at least one of a plurality of regions of digitized content from the at least one of the plurality of computers (fig 16, col 95-96).

14. As per claim 6, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses to request one region of digitized

content from the at least one of the plurality of computers (col 95-96).

15. As per claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses the request for one or more regions of digitized content is generated as a function of a pseudo-random sequence (track content, col 14, lines 56-60).

16. As per claim 8, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses the pseudo-random sequence is a function of a network address of the at least one of the plurality of computers (col 14, lines 24-67).

17. As per claim 9, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses wherein the pseudo-random sequence is a function of a time of day (col 93, lines 61-67).

18. As per claim 10, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses wherein the pseudo-random sequence is a function of both a network address of at least one of the plurality of computers and a time of day (user identification, col 94, lines 3-13).

19. As per claim 11, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses wherein the request for regions of digitized content is further comprised of a request for at least one of a plurality of decoy regions of digitized content from the at least one of the plurality of computers (user interface, col 88, lines 29-51).

20. As per claim 12, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses wherein the request for an at least one of a plurality of decoy regions of digitized content is a function of a pseudo-random sequence (HTML pages, col 88, lines 33-51).

21. As per claim 13, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses wherein the pseudo-random sequence is a function of a network address of the at least one of the plurality of computers (URL, col 88, lines 52-67).

22. As per claim 14, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses wherein the pseudo-random sequence is comprising a function of a time of day (col 43, lines 35-40).

23. As per claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses wherein the pseudo-random sequence is comprising a function of both a network address of the at least one of the plurality of computers and the time of day (URL, col 88, lines 33-51).

24. As per claim 16, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses wherein the request for one or more than regions of digitized content is further comprised of only one non-decoy region of digitized content from the at least one of the plurality of computers (content player, col 90, lines 55-64).

25. As per claim 17, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses wherein the verification database is further comprised of only one master table of contents identifier for each of a corresponding plurality of sets of digitized content (digital content library, col 95, lines 8-29).

26. As per claim 18, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses wherein the verification database is further comprised of only one master songprint identifier for each of a corresponding plurality of sets of digitized content (col 12, lines 17-25 and

col 31, lines 55-64)

27. As per claims 19 and 32, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses further programmed to verify whether the received table of content information correlates with the master table of content information (col 31, lines 55-64).

28. As per claims 20, 24, 28 and 33, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses to verify whether the received table of content information correlates perfectly with the master table of content information (col 31, lines 55-64).

29. As per claims 21, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses programmed to verify whether the received songprint identifiers correlates with the master songprint identifier (col 31, lines 55-64 and col 12, lines 17-25).

30. As per claims 22, 26, 34, and 35, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses further programmed to verify whether the received songprint identifier correlates perfectly with any master songprint identifier (col 31, lines 55-64 and col 12,

lines 17-25).

31. As per Claim 23, 25, 27 and 29 are rejected based on the same reasoning as claim 1, in addition to Hurtado discloses as a function of whether or not the received selections of table of contents information correlate with any of the master table of contents information (col 31, lines 55-64 and col 12, lines 17-25),

request at least one of a plurality of regions of digitized content from the at least one of plurality of computers (HTML pages, col 88, lines 33-51).

32. As per claim 36, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Hurtado discloses further programmed to generate the master table of contents identifier by performing steps of: reading table of contents data from the medium (col 67, lines 54-65); computing a cryptographic (col 30-40) hash value (col 42, lines 40-41) of the concatenation of the lengths of each track (col 14, lines 56-57) on the medium (col 41, lines 5-67); and truncating the cryptographic (col 16, line 7) hash value (col 17, lines 8-16).

55. As per claim 55, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Collart discloses each master songprint identifier is derived from a digitized content master, and wherein each received songprint identifier is derived from a digitized content copy (560, fig 5).

56. As per claim 56, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Collart discloses the server receives table of contents Information and a songprint identifier corresponding to the digitized content copy, and wherein the server is further programmed to use the received table of contents information and songprint identifiers to identify a correlation between a digitized content master having corresponding information stored in the verification database and the digitized content copy (600, 620, fig 6).

57. As per claim 57, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Collart discloses the server is further programmed to verify the digitized content copy using information stored in the verification database corresponding to the correlated digitized content master (600, 620, fig 6 and 560 fig 5).

58. As per claim 58, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Collart discloses the server is further programmed to request at least one content portion of the digitized content copy using the identified correlation between one of the digitized content masters and the digitized content copy (elements of fig 6 and 560 fig 5).

Conclusion

33. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S Patent 6,434,535

U.S. Patent 6,031,795

U.S. Patent 6,522,769

U.S. Publication 2005/0149759

U.S. Patent 6,560,403

U.S. Patent 6,952,523

34. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A. Siddiqi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER